



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

26  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,243	11/18/2003	Mark N. Heflin	991316	4994
7590	06/06/2005		EXAMINER	
United States Army Legal Services Agency Suite 527 901 North Stuart Street Arlington, VA 22203-1837			DINH, TIEN QUANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3644	

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/715,243	HEFLIN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Tien Dinh	3644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2005.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                    2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) 14 and 15 is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1 and 6-13 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) 2-5 is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)  Other: \_\_\_\_ .

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood et al in view of Kenzie and Tillman.

Underwood et al teaches a device that is used to cut the extraction line of the parachute in case of an emergency but is silent on the radio signal to initiate a cutter that is spring biased to cut the extraction line and means to restrict the cutter from cutting the extraction line. However, Kenzie teaches that a device to restrict a cutter from cutting a line 20 is well known in the art. Furthermore, Tillman discloses that radio controlled system to operate a device is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a remotely controlled cutter system that is spring biased to cut the extraction line and means to restrict the cutter from cutting the extraction line in place of Underwood et al's system as taught by Kenzie as a substitution of parts.

Please note that Underwood et al teaches the cutter having a housing 62. A housing has upper plate and lower plates and have pockets inbetween. One skilled in the art would have machined the housing to include mounting, guiding slots, and holes to accommodate the parts inside and to save weight. Please note that spacers, clamping means, and aluminum metals are well known in this day and age to have been used to create housings.

***Response to Arguments***

The Examiner in the previous office action took official notice that remote control means are well known in this day and age and that one skilled in the art would have used remote control means to control the cutting of the extraction line. Tillman was introduced to show that remote control means to control distant actuators are well known in the art since applicant seems to challenge the notion that radio control elements are not known. However, the Examiner used combination Underwood et al in view of Kenzie and Tillman show that claimed invention is met by these prior arts. Firstly, Underwood et al was used to show a device that is used to cut the extraction line of the parachute in case of an emergency is well known in the art. Kenzie was introduced to show that a device to restrict a spring-biased cutter from cutting a line 20 is well known in the art. Tillman shows that a radio control means to control a distant actuator is well known. Taken this into account, it would have been obvious to have used a device to restrict a spring-biased cutter from cutting a line 20 and then release the device to restrict when activated to cut a line in place of Underwood's device as a substitution of parts. Tillman was used to show that it is obvious to have made the whole system remotely controlled.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 2-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 14-15 are allowed.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tien Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-6899. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 571-272-7045. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TD

*Tina*